DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 071 EA 005 288

AUTHOR Fisher, James R.
TITLE The Relationship of Sex, Level, and Position of Oregon Educators to Attitudinal Statements That Deal with Collective Negotiations and Sanctions.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
REPORT NO OSSC-Bull-Vol-13-No-1
PUB DATE Sep 69
NOTE 35p.
AVAILABLE FROM Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($1.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Analysis of Variance; Boards of Education; *Collective Negotiation; Decision Making; *Elementary Schools; Sanctions; *Secondary Schools; Statistical Studies; Tables (Data); Teacher Associations; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Militancy; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

The decade of the 1960's witnessed an ever-increasing demand by members of the teaching profession for a greater voice in the determination of policies affecting the educational system. Teachers pressed for a more active role in what previously had been considered an administrative function. For this investigation of Oregon educator attitudes toward collective negotiations and sanctions, scores were obtained from a sample population comprising subsets of male and female elementary and secondary teachers, and male and female elementary and secondary principals. Correlations were run to determine the relationship between scales of Progressivism and Traditionalism, to Collective Negotiations and Sanctions. Study results indicated that, generally speaking, respondents with progressive viewpoints tended to favor collective negotiations, and vice versa; male secondary principals and female elementary teachers indicated no relationship between collective negotiations and progressivism; no significant relationship was shown to exist between collective negotiations and traditionalism (with the possible exception of male secondary teachers), and no significant relationship was found between sanctions and progressivism (with the possible exception of female secondary teachers.) (Author/WM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO

ED 081071

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

BULLETIN

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SEX, LEVEL, AND POSITION OF OREGON EDUCATORS TO ATTITUDINAL STATEMENTS THAT DEAL WITH COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND SANCTIONS

by
James R. Fisher

Vol. 13, No. 1 September, 1969

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL
College of Education
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

EA 005 288

ED 081071

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SEX, LEVEL, AND POSITION OF OREGON EDUCATORS TO ATTITUDINAL STATEMENTS THAT DEAL WITH COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND SANCTIONS

by

James R. Fisher

Assistant Executive Secretary
Oregon School Boards Association
University of Oregon

Individual Copy Price - $1.50

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Definition of Terms	3
Summary of Review of Literature	3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	5
Data Gathering Instruments	6
Population and Sample	7
Data Gathering Procedure	9
Procedure in Analysis of Data	9
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	10
Correlation	10
Analysis of Variance	13
Conclusions	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Sample Size and Response Percentage	8
2	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Results Collective Negotiation - Progressivism	11
3	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Results Collective Negotiation - Traditionalism	14
4	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Results Sanctions - Progressivism	16
5	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Results Sanctions - Traditionalism	18
6	Three-Way Analysis of Variance - Collective Negotiation Results	20
7	Three-Way Analysis of Variance - Sanctions Results	22
8	Three-Way Analysis of Variance - ESI-A Results (Progressivism)	25
9	Three-Way Analysis of Variance - ESI-B Results (Traditionalism)	27

VITA

Name: James R. Fisher

Present Position: Assistant Executive Secretary
Oregon School Boards Association
University of Oregon

Educational Background:

Bachelor of Science, 1960, Minot State College, Minot, North Dakota
Master of Education, 1965, University of Oregon, Eugene
Doctor of Education, 1967, University of Oregon, Eugene

Professional Experience:

Teacher, 1960-1965, West Fir High School, West Fir, Oregon
Vice Principal, 1964-1965, West Fir High School, West Fir, Oregon
Graduate Research Assistant, 1965-1967, University of Oregon
Administrative Assistant, 1967-1968, U. S. Office of Education,
Washington, D. C.

Educational Organizations:

Member, American Association of School Administrators
Vice President, Phi Delta Kappa, University chapter

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the 1960's has witnessed an ever-increasing demand by members of the teaching profession for a greater voice in the determination of policies affecting the educational system. Teachers are pressing for a more active role in what has previously been considered an administrative function.

The two most influential organizations leading the struggle for increased influence in evolving school board policies are the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The NEA is a historical professional association of educators, including both teachers and administrators. The AFT is a teachers-only organization affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The AFT was organized in 1915 by a disaffected group from the NEA.

The process which enables the teaching profession to be directly involved in the development of school policy has been defined differently by the NEA and the AFT. The NEA refers to the process as "professional negotiation," and the AFT refers to the same process as "collective bargaining." Some respected authorities not connected with either the NEA or the AFT have asserted that there are no differences, or only relatively unimportant ones, between these procedures.[1] There is a need for terminology to eliminate the semantic problem involved in the discussion of these procedures which will allow teachers to analyze collective action without associating the terms adopted by any particular organization with the process involved. Regardless of the procedure adopted or how it is labeled, it is desirable to evolve terminology that does not prejudge or appear to prejudge the issues that are faced when teachers as a group negotiate with school boards.[2] To reduce emotional charge and to avoid a modal term, "collective negotiation" will be used here to embrace the idea of developing policies cooperatively.

The Problem

Michael Moskow, a former employee-relations consultant for the Philadelphia Board of Education, recently stated:

> The dramatic changes that have taken place recently in the National Education Association and in the American Federation of Teachers clearly indicate that some form of

---

[1] Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiation for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966), p. 2.

[2] Ibid.

> collective negotiation will be widely used in future years to determine the salaries and conditions of employment of public school teachers.[3]

The fact that collective negotiation has been and will continue to be a major issue in public education can be documented by the many officially adopted written procedures and the legislation that has been enacted in several states.

> As of September 20, 1965, some 388 professional agreements, in 35 states, had been filed with NEA. There are probably additional hundreds of professional negotiation agreements, copies of which have been filed with NEA; perhaps a total of as many as 1,000.[4]

By February, 1966, seven states had enacted statutes requiring boards of education to negotiate with designated representatives of their teaching staffs.[5] The differences among the statutes often reflect basic issues which must be resolved in the light of relevant experience under the statutes. Certainly, future legislation should take advantage of what has already been accomplished in this area.[6]

Oregon is one of the states which has enacted legislation dealing with collective negotiation. Senate Bill 186 became a law early in 1965 when Governor Mark O. Hatfield officially signed it. The bill was sponsored by the Oregon Education Association (OEA) and met some resistance from the Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA). The AFL-CIO strongly opposed the bill because it removed teachers from the provisions of collective bargaining.[7]

The evidence suggests that the incidence of collective action between educators and their boards of education is increasing rapidly in the state of Oregon. Since the passage of SB 186, there have been over 100 agreements drawn between teachers and their school boards.[8]

---

[3]Michael Moskow, "Recent Legislation Affecting Collective Negotiation for Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, No. 3 (November, 1965) pp. 136-140.

[4]T. M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1966) p. 18.

[5]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., p. 447.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Moskow, op. cit., p. 136.

[8]Interview with Roy E. Dancer, Director of Professional Services, OEA, September 13, 1966.

The present study represents an attempt to determine the attitudes of Oregon teachers and principals toward the basic issues of this growing phenomenon in the education profession. In addition to dealing with educators' attitudes toward collective negotiations, this study deals with their attitudes toward a related activity--sanctions.

Definition of Terms

Collective Negotiation. A generic term that includes all forms of collective action by employees when discussing conditions of employment relationships with employers. This term includes both collective bargaining and professional negotiation.

Professional Negotiation. A term developed by the NEA referring to a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local association and the school board, which provides an orderly procedure for the school board and the local association to negotiate on matters of mutual concern, to reach agreement on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse.

Sanctions. A means to prevent the violation of a right or responsibility. "Sanctions," as defined by the NEA, mean "censure, suspension or expulsion of a member; severance of relationship with an affiliated association or other agency; imposing of a deterrent against a board of education or other agency controlling the welfare of the schools; bringing into play forces that will enable the community to help the board or agency to realize its responsibility; or the application of one or more steps in the withholding of services." The strike is also considered a type of sanction in the study.

Level. The distinction between the elementary school and the secondary school. For purposes of this study, the elementary level will comprise grades 1-6, and the secondary level grades 7-12. The junior high school was eliminated from the study.

Position. The distinction between the classroom teacher and a person assigned to administrative duties.

Summary of Review of Literature

A review of the literature in the field of collective negotiations and sanctions makes clear that a major revolution is taking place in the public schools. Complacency is being replaced by a militant corps of teachers. The following conclusions have been reached as a result of this investigation:

1. The insistence of members of the teaching profession to be collectively engaged in policy determination had its beginnings in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

2. There are more men entering the teaching profession, which accounts in part for the demand of teachers to be engaged in decision-making.

3. Men and women teachers of today are far better educated than at any time in history. This, too, helps to explain the demand to be actively engaged in the formulation of the policies which affect them.

4. The concept of "democratic administration" has gained acceptance in the education field.

5. The AFT and the NEA have been engaged in a power struggle. No overt signs of a lessening of that struggle are visible, although Lieberman predicts a merger of the two organizations in the future.

6. The concept of collective negotiations in education was formalized in 1962 after the UFT victory in New York City.

7. There has been a shift in the power base in the public schools. As a result of increased membership in their organizations, teachers are gradually attaining a position from which a certain degree of power may be exerted.

8. The major distinction between collective bargaining and professional negotiation is the climate in which the negotiations take place.

9. The major distinction between a "sanction" and a strike is that strikes are considered to be unprofessional.

10. Public employees have the legal right to join any organization of their choosing, and the right of employees to negotiate with their employers is gaining acceptance in many states.

11. The right of a public employee to strike is generally denied by statute.

12. The right of school boards to delegate their authority is unsettled in the courts and in the minds of those concerned.

13. The roles of the superintendent and the principal in collective negotiations are the subject of much controversy and speculation.

14. The review of literature covered the events as of January, 1967.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Attitude scales are designed to elicit emotional responses rather than responses that are the product of the experience and association of the respondent to the topic under study. Guilford states that there is a positive correlation between what people say on a subject and what they will do about it.[9]

Many Oregon educators have been directly involved in the procedures of collective negotiation; many have been indirectly involved; and many have had no experience whatsoever with collective negotiation. The statements that are a part of the Collective Action (CA) Scale of this study have been constructed to minimize the possibility that first-hand experience with collective negotiation would be a factor in the response to any particular item.

The design and methodology employed in this study are a partial replication of the study done in North Carolina by Patrick W. Carlton, in 1966. The Carlton study was limited to the variables of sex and position. This study utilized the format of Carlton's study but broadened the scope of investigation by the inclusion of a third variable, level of employment, i.e., the distinction between elementary and secondary school positions.

A further point of departure from the Carlton study was the separation of the items in the Collective Action Scale. The Carlton study combined the collective action and sanctions items into one composite score for each subset, as was indicated by the fourth assumption given below. The present study sought to make a clear distinction between collective negotiations and sanctions. Therefore, the 15 items in the CA Scale that deal exclusively with collective negotiations were combined and are referred to as the CA-I Scale, and the 15 items that dealt exclusively with sanctions were combined and are referred to as the CA-II Scale. The reason for this distinction is that the two concepts appear to be completely independent of one another.

Two attitudinal measures were employed so that some degree of cross-validation could be effected. The Kerlinger Education Scale I was used in addition to the Carlton Collective Action Scale. A pilot study was conducted during the summer of 1965 by Carlton which yielded results which indicated that the two scales measured effective responses in a similar manner. The ES-I Scale results correlated with the CA Scale results should yield valuable information in assessing the attitudinal consistency of the educators involved.

---

[9] J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1954) p. 457.

Data Gathering Instruments

Collective Action Scale. The CA Scale is a 30-item Likert-type scale designed to elicit attitudes of educators toward sanctions and collective action by teachers. The scale developed was based on the following assumptions: (1) that attitudes are quantitatively identifiable and therefore can be assigned score values, (2) that attitudes are on a continuum from strong agreement to equally strong disagreement, (3) that an undecided attitude occupies a neutral or middle position on the continuum, and (4) that collective negotiation is made up of at least two complementary facets--the negotiatory process, and sufficient coercive force to assure near equality of the parties involved. These were assumed to be non-separable characteristics.

The scoring of the CA Scale was from one to five. The CA Scale has a total of 30 statements. Fifteen statements were designed so that agreement indicated a favorable attitude toward collective negotiations or sanctions, and 15 statements were designed so that agreement indicated an unfavorable attitude toward collective negotiations or sanctions.

The CA Scale was composed of two separate elements. Items 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, and 30 deal primarily with the aspect of collective negotiations. Items 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 29 deal primarily with sanctions of one type or another. The items were incorporated into one scale with the order of the I and II items randomized.

The scores for any individual would fall between 15 and 75 on either the CA-I Scale or the CA-II Scale. The scores above 45 indicated attitudes that tended to be favorable toward collective negotiations or sanctions, depending upon the scale being considered, and the scores below 45 indicated attitudes that tended to be unfavorable toward collective negotiations or sanctions. The score of 45 indicated a median or neutral point on the CA Scale.

Kerlinger Education Scale I. The ES-I Scale, a 20-item, Likert-type inventory, measures two basic factors underlying attitudes toward education, Progressivism and Traditionalism. There has been considerable discussion in educational circles with respect to the apparent dichotomy in educational values and attitudes. The educational schism corresponds well to the liberal-conservative dimension, but it has certain characteristics which suggest that the words "traditionalism" and "progressivism" might be appropriate. [10]

Kerlinger suggests that individuals can be categorized by a traditional-progressive dichotomy and that certain individuals will exhibit the cleavage more than others, depending upon their positions, knowledge, and

---

[10] Fred N. Kerlinger, "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII (1958) p. 111.

experience in education. Emphasis in the traditional viewpoint is more on the teaching of subject matter for its own sake, and a considerable amount of importance is placed on the hierarchical notion of relationships, i.e., impersonal superior-inferior relationships. The status quo attitude is dominant.[11] The progressive viewpoint emphasizes the problem-solving approach with children's interests and needs considered basic to education. Warmth in interpersonal relationships is stressed, and liberal social beliefs are thought to be the avenues through which education can initiate social change.[12]

Because the ES-I Scale is a method of determining whether an individual is inclined to adhere to liberal social beliefs (progressivism), or conservative status quo philosophy (traditionalism), a comparison with the responses made on the Collective Action Scale seems appropriate. The CA Scale measured favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward what might be considered an attempt by members of the education profession to initiate social change, i.e., collective negotiation on matters that have been historically considered to be an administrative function, and the application of sanctions as a means of forcing demands.

The ES-I Scale constituted a total of 20 items. The A items, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, and 20, were highly saturated progressive statements. The B items, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, and 19, were highly saturated traditional statements. The 20 items were incorporated into one scale with the order of the A and B items randomized.

Scoring of the ES-I Scale was accomplished by the use of a seven-point Likert-type scale. The scoring was done separately for both the A items and the B items. For both the A and B sections individually, a high score of 70 was possible and minimum score of 10. A score of 40 was considered a neutral point.

Population and Sample

The population involved in the study was all of the teachers and principals of public schools in Oregon with the exception of those in the junior high schools. The sample draws from those personnel on file with the State Department of Education as public elementary or high school teachers and principals.

Information about the population under study was obtained from the 1965-66 personnel cards on file with the State Department of Education. Additional female elementary principals were drawn from the 1966-67 files because of the limited number available from the 1965-66 cards.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 112.

[12] Ibid.

The population was divided by three criteria: sex, level, and position. The division produced eight separate cells, each with a distinct population. The subsets were: male elementary teacher; female elementary teacher; male secondary teacher; female secondary teacher; male elementary principal; female elementary principal; male secondary principal; and female secondary principal.

The research instrument was sent to each person in each of the eight subsets, i.e., 200 male elementary teachers, 200 female elementary teachers, 200 male secondary teachers, 200 female secondary teachers, 193 male elementary principals, 141 female elementary principals, 159 male secondary principals, and 4 female secondary principals. The female secondary principals cell was so small that a sex x level x position interaction analysis was not attempted.

The research design included 100 subjects for each of the subsets with the exception of female elementary principals and female secondary principals. When a subset accumulated over 100 responses, a table of random numbers was employed to limit the subset size to 100. The sending of more questionnaires than were actually needed allowed for a change of position from last year, and a certain percentage of non-respondents. Table 1 provides details of the sample size, which includes a summary of the percentage of response from each subset and the total response percentage. Table abbreviations are as follows: Male (M), Female (F), Elementary (E), Secondary (S), Teacher (T), and Principal (P).

TABLE 1

SAMPLE SIZE AND RESPONSE PERCENTAGE

Subset	Used	Received	Total Sent	Total % Received
M E T	100	120	200	60.0
F E T	100	107	200	53.5
M S T	100	107	200	53.5
F S T	100	101	200	50.5
M E P	100	128	193	66.3
F E P	95	95	141	67.4
M S P	100	122	159	76.7
F S P	3	3	4	75.0
Overall	698	782	1297	60.4

Data Gathering Procedure

The subjects chosen to respond to the instruments were contacted by mail. A first class letter was sent to the subjects requesting their participation and cooperation. The contents of the envelope were: (1) a questionnaire which included the ES-I Scale, the CA Scale, a biographical data sheet, and an endorsement from Keith Goldhammer, Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Oregon, and (2) a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

Two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up post card was sent to those who had not yet returned the completed instrument. Six weeks after the initial mailing date, a second attempt was made to encourage the subjects who had not yet returned the instrument to do so. The second attempt consisted of a letter urging the cooperation of the subject.

The instrument was designed to insure anonymity (no signature block); therefore, a coding procedure was used to facilitate the follow-up process.

Procedure in Analysis of Data

Analysis of the data was accomplished through use of the Control Data 3300 computer. The program was written in the computer center at Oregon State University. The data were initially punched onto cards which were fed into the computer for analysis.

Two basic statistical tools were employed during the study--the Pearson-product moment correlation, and a three-way analysis of variance using a least squares solution.

Pearson-product moment correlations were used to determine if there were any significant relationships between the scales. Correlations were computed between the CA-I and ESI-A, the CA-I and ESI-B, the CA-II and ESI-A, and between the CA-II and the ESI-B scales. The correlations were computed for each of the following subsets: male elementary teachers, female elementary teachers, male secondary teachers, female secondary teachers, male elementary principals, female elementary principals, male secondary principals, and female secondary principals. Three-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether there were any significant differences in response within the sample population. Since there were only three female secondary principals, a standard analysis of variance could not be used. Therefore, a least squares analysis of variance, which accounts for disproportionate cells, was employed. The design was laid out so the analysis of variance table would be as follows:

Source	df
Mean	1
Sex	1
Level	1
Position	1
Sex x level	1
Sex x position	1
Position x level	1
Error	691
Total	698

As outlined in Table 1, a random sample of Oregon educators was selected, numbering 1,297. The number of returns that were used in the design was 698. There were 782 questionnaires actually returned (60.4%), and a table of random numbers was employed to delimit the amount to 100 for each subset. This randomization procedure was used in all cases where there were over 100 responses in any particular subset. The returns were classified into eight categories based on sex, level, and position of Oregon educators.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purposes of the study were to (1) identify, (2) describe, (3) measure, and (4) compare the attitudes of Oregon educators toward collective negotiations and toward sanctions. The Kerlinger ES-I Scale, which measures progressive-traditional educational values, was used as a method of cross-validation with the attitudes indicated by the response to the CA-I (collective negotiations), and the CA-II Scales (sanctions).

The Pearson product-moment correlation and a three-way analysis of variance using a least squares solution were the statistical tools employed. There is some evidence that the use of a least squares solution with unequal cell frequencies provides a more powerful test.[13] The t test of significance was not used because there were very few significant F ratios.

In the presentation of results, the null hypothesis was tested for the various situations under study. In interpretation, acceptance of the null hypothesis indicated that the relationship reported was not significant; rejection of the null hypothesis indicated a significant relationship. The null hypothesis states that any relationships found may be due to sampling error for a given number of observations. Thus, to reject the null hypothesis, actually, is to accept the fact that the relationship reported is not due to sampling error at the stated level of significance. The same type of interpretation exists for the correlations and the F ratios reported in this chapter.

Correlation

Correlations were run to determine the relationship between the CA-I Scale (Collective Negotiations) and the ESI-A Scale (Progressivism); between the CA-I Scale and the ESI-B Scale (Traditionalism); between the CA-II Scale (Sanctions) and the ESI-A Scale; between the CA-II Scale and the ESI-B Scale. The hypotheses were all stated in the null form. Therefore, an acceptance of the hypothesis indicated no significant correlation and a rejection of the hypothesis indicated a significant correlation.

The eight subset results indicating the relationship between collective negotiations and progressivism are given in Table 2. The null hypothesis was rejected in five of the eight subsets included in the design. Those subsets showing a rejection of the hypothesis were the male elementary teachers, male secondary teachers, male elementary principals, female secondary teachers, and female elementary principals. A rejection of the null hypothesis indicated that there was a definite relationship between

---

[13] B. J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962) p. 224.

TABLE 2

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION RESULTS COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS - PROGRESSIVISM

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
I-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.261	.01	Rejected
I-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.244	.05	Rejected
II-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary principals toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.395	.01	Rejected
II-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary principals toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.139	N.S.	Accepted
III-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.111	N.S.	Accepted
III-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.279	.01	Rejected

TABLE 2 - Continued

Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
IV-A. There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary principals toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	95	.290	.01	Rejected
IV-B. There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary principals toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism in educational matters.	3	.777	N.S.	Accepted

the scores on the Collective Negotiations Scale and the scores on the Progressivism Scale. The null hypothesis was accepted in the case of the remaining three subsets, which meant that there was no apparent relationship between the scores of the two scales.

The subset results indicating the relationship between the scores on the Collective Negotiations Scale and the scores on the Traditionalism Scale are given in Table 3. The null hypothesis was accepted for seven of the eight subsets. The only subset for which the null hypothesis was not accepted was male secondary teachers. Acceptance of the null hypothesis indicated that there was no significant relationship between collective negotiations and traditionalism.

The subset results indicating the relationship between the scores on the Sanctions Scale and the scores on the Progressivism Scale are given in Table 4. The null hypothesis was accepted for seven of the eight subsets. The null hypothesis was rejected for female secondary teachers. Rejection of the null hypothesis was evidence of a significant relationship between the scales.

The results of the eight subsets with respect to the relationship between sanctions and traditionalism are given in Table 5. The null hypothesis was accepted for five of the eight subsets, which indicated that there was no significant relationship between sanctions and traditionalism. The subsets for which the null hypothesis was accepted were male elementary teachers, female elementary teachers, female secondary teachers, female elementary principals, and female secondary principals. The null hypothesis was rejected for the remaining three subsets, an indication that there was a significant relationship between the two scales. It should be noted that in two of the three subsets, the relationship, while significant, was negative in nature.

Analysis of Variance

A three-way analysis of variance was used to determine the difference in attitudes of Oregon educators with respect to the variables of sex, position, and level. The interaction between sex and level, sex and position, and level and position was also determined. A separate analysis was run to determine the attitudes of Oregon educators toward collective negotiations, sanctions, progressivism, and traditionalism. The hypotheses were all stated in the null form.

The attitudes of the Oregon educators surveyed with respect to collective negotiation are found in Table 6. There was a significant difference in the attitudes of principals and teachers toward collective negotiation based on their position. There were no significant differences in attitudes from a standpoint of sex or level. There was no significant interaction within the collective negotiations analysis.

TABLE 3

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION RESULTS COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS - TRADITIONALISM

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
IX-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.156	N.S.	Accepted
IX-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.201	.05	Rejected
X-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary principals toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.082	N.S.	Accepted
X-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary principals toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.044	N.S.	Accepted
XI-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.184	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 3 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
XI-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary teachers toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.081	N.S.	Accepted
XII-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary principals toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	95	-.161	N.S.	Accepted
XII-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary principals toward collective negotiations and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	3	-.988	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 4

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION RESULTS SANCTIONS - PROGRESSIVISM

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
V-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary teachers toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.173	N.S.	Accepted
V-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary teachers toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.164	N.S.	Accepted
VI-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary principals toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.092	N.S.	Accepted
VI-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary principals toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.054	N.S.	Accepted
VII-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary teachers toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.053	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 4 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
VII-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary teachers toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	100	.364	.01	Rejected
VIII-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary principals toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	95	.008	N.S.	Accepted
VIII-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary principals toward sanctions and toward progressivism in educational matters.	3	-.960	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 5

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION RESULTS SANCTIONS - TRADITIONALISM

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
XIII-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary teachers toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.071	N.S.	Accepted
XIII-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary teachers toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.215	.05	Rejected
XIV-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male elementary principals toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.254	.05	Rejected
XIV-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of male secondary principals toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	.209	.05	Rejected
XV-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary teachers toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	.044	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 5 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	N	r	p	Hypothesis
XV-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary teachers toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	100	-.155	N.S.	Accepted
XVI-A.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female elementary principals toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	95	-.075	N.S.	Accepted
XVI-B.	There is no significant correlation between the attitudes of female secondary principals toward sanctions and toward traditionalism in educational matters.	3	-.693	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 6

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION RESULTS

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XVII-A.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of male and female educators in Oregon toward collective negotiations.	Sex	1	92.4902	1.152	N.S.	Accepted
XVII-B.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of principals and teachers in Oregon toward collective negotiations.	Position	1	416.8892	5.191	.05	Rejected
XVII-C.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of elementary and secondary educators in Oregon toward collective negotiations.	Level	1	5.9879	.075	N.S.	Accepted
XVII-D.	There is no significant interaction between sex and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward collective negotiations.	S x P	1	5.1686	.064	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 6 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XVII-E.	There is no significant interaction between sex and level of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward collective negotiation.	S x L	1	91.7845	1.143	N.S.	Accepted
XVII-F.	There is no significant interaction between level and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward collective negotiation.	L x P	1	48.4422	.603	N.S.	Accepted
		Within	691	80.3114			

The attitudes of the Oregon educators surveyed toward sanctions are found in Table 7. Two of the six sources of variance within the analysis indicated a rejection of the null hypothesis. The position source of variance data indicated that there is a significant difference in the attitudes of the principals and teachers toward sanctions. The level x position source of variance data indicated that there is a significant interaction between the level and position of Oregon educators with respect to sanctions. The data in the remaining four sources of variance indicated an acceptance of the null hypothesis; i.e., no significant differences were found in the remainder of the sanctions analysis.

The attitudes of the population tested toward progressivism are found in Table 8. The data from all six sources of variance within the analysis indicated an acceptance of the null hypothesis. The acceptance of the null hypothesis for the variance of sex, level, or position indicated that there were no significant differences in the attitudes of Oregon educators toward progressivism. The data in the sources of variance of sex x position, sex x level, and level x position showed no significant interaction anywhere within the analysis.

The attitude of Oregon educators toward traditionalism are found in Table 9. The data from five of the six possible sources of variance indicated an acceptance of the null hypothesis. In accepting the null hypothesis, the data from the sex, position, or level source of variance indicated no significant differences in the attitudes of Oregon educators toward traditionalism in educational matters. The sex x position, and level x position sources of variance indicated that there was no significant interaction among Oregon educators within these sources of variance. The null hypothesis was rejected for the sex x level source of variance, an indication that there was a significant interaction between these two variables.

Conclusions

1. Low but significant correlations between attitudes toward collective negotiations and progressivism were found in five of the eight subsets. Generally speaking, those respondents holding progressive viewpoints tended to favor collective negotiations, and vice versa.

2. Male secondary principals and female elementary teachers indicated no relationship between collective negotiations and progressivism.

3. With the exception of male secondary teachers, no significant relationship was shown to exist between collective negotiations and traditionalism. The significance evident in the male secondary teachers subset was probably a result of their high score on the Collective Negotiations Scale.

4. No significant relationship was found between sanctions and progressivism, except in the subset of female secondary teachers. The correlation obtained there was probably a result of the high score on the Progressivism Scale.

TABLE 7

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - SANCTIONS RESULTS

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XVIII-A.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of male and female educators in Oregon toward sanctions.	Sex	1	373.7260	3.302	N.S.	Accepted
XVIII-B.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of principals and teachers in Oregon toward sanctions.	Position	1	948.2670	8.379	.01	Rejected
XVIII-C.	There are no significance differences in the attitudes of elementary and secondary educators in Oregon toward sanctions.	Level	1	14.0577	.124	N.S.	Accepted
XVIII-D.	There is no significant interaction between sex and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward sanctions.	S x P	1	9.2454	.082	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 7 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XVIII-E.	There is no significant interaction between sex and level of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward sanctions.	S x L	1	14.7214	.130	N.S.	Accepted
XVIII-F.	There is no significant interaction between level and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward sanctions.	L x P	1	442.1158	3.907	.05	Rejected
		Within	691	113.1689			

TABLE 8

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - ESI-A RESULTS (PROGRESSIVISM)

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
X-A.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of male and female educators in Oregon toward progressivism in educational matters.	Sex	1	9.7524	.227	N.S.	Accepted
X-B.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of principals and teachers in Oregon toward progressivism in educational matters.	Position	1	26.9865	.627	N.S.	Accepted
X-C.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of elementary and secondary educators in Oregon toward progressivism in educational matters.	Level	1	1.3512	.031	N.S.	Accepted
X-D.	There is no significant interaction between sex and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward progressivism in educational matters.	S x P	1	5.0429	1.171	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 8 - Continued

Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
X-E. There is no significant interaction between sex and level of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward progressivism in educational matters.	S x L	1	15.8236	.368	N.S.	Accepted
X-F. There is no significant interaction between level and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward progressivism in educational matters.	L x P	1	12.6371	.294	N.S.	Accepted
	Within	691	43.0549			

TABLE 9

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - ESI-B RESULTS (TRADITIONALISM)

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XI-A.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of male and female educators in Oregon toward traditionalism in educational matters.	Sex	1	5.5179	.095	N.S.	Accepted
XI-B.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of principals and teachers in Oregon toward traditionalism in educational matters.	Position	1	195.6452	3.374	N.S.	Accepted
XI-C.	There are no significant differences in the attitudes of elementary and secondary educators in Oregon toward traditionalism in educational matters.	Level	1	35.7463	.616	N.S.	Accepted
XI-D.	There is no significant interaction between sex and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward traditionalism in educational matters.	S x P	1	22.4274	.387	N.S.	Accepted

TABLE 9 - Continued

	Null Hypothesis	Source of Variance	df	Mean Square	f	p	Hypothesis
XI-E.	There is no significant interaction between sex and level of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward traditionalism in educational matters.	S x L	1	269.1152	4.640	.05	Rejected
XI-F.	There is no significant interaction between level and position of Oregon educators in their attitudes toward traditionalism in educational matters.	L x P	1	22.1889	.383	N.S.	Accepted
		Within	691	57.9937			

5. Five of the eight subsets saw no relationship between sanctions and traditionalism. Male secondary teachers and male elementary principals perceived these two concepts as inversely related. Male secondary principals showed a positive relationship which was a result of a neutral score on both scales.

6. Generally speaking, Oregon educators are a homogeneous group with respect to their attitudes toward collective negotiations, although a significant difference does occur between principals and teachers.

7. Male teachers tended to be the most favorable toward collective negotiations.

8. Female teachers scored relatively high on the Collective Negotiations Scale; therefore, no significant difference was found relative to sex. This finding is not consistent with the prevailing thought pertaining to female non-activism.

9. There was no significant difference in the attitudes of Oregon educators toward collective negotiations based on the level at which they were employed.

10. Principals in Oregon tended to respond in a more neutral fashion with respect to statements dealing with collective negotiations, although male elementary principals indicated a near favorable attitude.

11. A significant difference was found in the attitudes toward sanctions based on the position of Oregon educators. Teachers and principals held different views with respect to sanctions.

12. Generally speaking, teachers were more favorable toward sanctions than were principals, although the mean score for both groups was nearer the neutral position. Male teachers were significantly more favorable toward sanctions than were female teachers. Female elementary teachers indicated an unfavorable attitude toward sanctions.

13. Principals, particularly female principals, tended to display an unfavorable attitude toward sanctions.

14. There were no significant differences in the attitudes of Oregon educators toward progressivism in educational matters. The majority of the educators involved tended to hold a progressive viewpoint with respect to educational matters.

15. Generally speaking, the majority of the educators involved in the study tended to hold a somewhat neutral position with respect to traditionalism.

16. The responses to the progressivism and traditionalism scales were generally consistent, indicating the respondents held a clear-cut belief system. Male elementary principals were the most consistent in this regard, scoring high on the Progressivism Scale and below the neutral position on the Traditionalism Scale.